DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 194 096 IR 008 963

AUTHOR Roberts, Don
TITLE Report on Past and Present Censorship of Non-Book Media in Public Libraries.
SPONS AGENCY Council on Library Resources, Inc., Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 37p.: Best copy available.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Freedom: *Audiovisual Aids: *Bias: *Censorship: Freedom of Speech: Interviews: Library Collections: *Nonprint Media: *Public Libraries

ABSTRACT

This study of nonprint media censorship focuses on the American Library Association's position, follows up actual censorship cases, and examines selected libraries' attitudes and policies toward nonprint materials. It concludes that a "primacy of print" attitude has established a de facto form of censorship, and recommends seven correctional courses of action. Appendices include outlines of both institutional and individual considerations explored during on site visits, a selected bibliography, and budgetary information. (RAA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED194096

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

REPORT ON PAST AND PRESENT CENSORSHIP OF NON-BOOK MEDIA IN PUBLIC LIBRARIES

by

Don Roberts

Wave Project
Pyramid Films

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Don Roberts

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

This Report was funded by a fellowship grant provided by the Council On Library Resources in Washington D.C.

1976

IR008963

My Thanks to:

Carl Spaulding & other CLR staff
Hennepin County Library
Pyramid Films
Ed Peltier, his staff & the Boston Public Library
Diane Purtill, her staff & the Chicago Public Library
Penny Northern, her staff & the Kansas City Public Library
Joyce Sumbi, her staff & the Los Angeles County Public Library System
American Library Association staff

& (last but not least) the many many librarians who responded to letters so generously.

REPORT ON PAST AND PRESENT CENSORSHIP OF

NON-BOOK MEDIA IN PUBLIC LIBRARIES

INTRODUCTION

My interest in this subject comes from several sources:

1) Teaching intellectual freedom courses in a library school.

2) My membership for several years in the American Civil Liberties Union.

3) The impression made upon me by the Fiske Report (prior censorship problem) in my graduate work in library school.

4) Observation of the censorship of non-book in my work.

5) My study of Communication Theory.

The focus of the study was to be threefold:

1) A Study of ALA's stance toward the problem.

2) The follow-up of the few actual censorship cases involving the public.

3) Visits to libraries to examine the climate of openness and closedness toward the "newer media".

There were changes in the proposed plan to accommodate the resource people involved, the logistical problems, and some of the changes (approved as I went) with the plan itself. Thus I changed the sequence of visits to better prepare myself to engage the ALA's IFO and others on the issues, and upon reflection discovered that it

would be better to do the visits from East to West rather than jumping from Chicago to California, and then from Kansas City to Boston.

THE STUDY

I. Literature Search

First, I went through bound volumes by the mentors of intellectual freedom such as Robert Downs, Leroy Merritt, Marjorie Fiske, Lester Asheim, David Berninghausen, and Eli Oboler. With one exception, Berninghausen, I found no specific mention of non-print media at all. There is an occasional reference to "materials" as mentioned in the Library Bill of Rights, but it is obvious that the notables in the field simply have not concerned themselves with non-print media.

Second, I went through Library Literature and Reader's Guide to look for cases and articles on the subject. This included the Intellectual Freedom Newsletter, audio-visual and media magazines, and the usual professional bill of fare. I found only five "cases" of non-book censorship in the past twenty years, only two of which were of any magnitude. There is only one column devoted to the subject, which started in Sightlines in the fall of 1975. The professional media journals (e.g., A-V Instruction) seemingly have no interest in censorship save that of the copyright issue. I discovered some on-going work by scholars in library schools--only one of these studies focused on media, while another mentioned non-print but in a secondary way. Some of the people contacted for clarification did not answer my letters.

My conclusions to the reading were that there is a severe "printism"* taken for granted in our profession. The standard documents (everything from the Intellectual Freedom Manual and the Intellectual Freedom Newsletter to the classic books in the field and typical articles in library journals) are so infected with the semantic assumptions that insure that "intellectual" is 'a priori' a print matter and that the mention of non-print (a nebulous, non-active concern for "other materials") be treated in a tertiary sense. This "printist" attitude has its direct parallels in "racism" and "sexism" and, as an ingrained conditioning, will be very difficult to weed out of the library profession.

II. Follow-up to the Literature Search

I wrote to all the libraries which have experienced non-print censorship in the last twenty years (which has been documented in the journals): Peoria Public Library (Illinois), Free Library of Philadelphia, Fairfax County Library (Virginia), Iowa State Travelling Library, and the Los Angeles County Library. I received answers to all my letters, but not specifically to all my queries.

The most interesting case (potentially) was the first landmark case in Peoria concerning United Nations films. This case set off a controversy which ultimately resulted in the addition of a footnote to the Library Bill of Rights (about "all materials and media of communication used or collected by libraries") in 1951. The present director in

*Printism is defined here as the dominance in library and publishing communication by the unexamined semantics of print concern (e.g., in professional publications, job descriptions, professional training and standards, etc.).

Peoria denies that the ALA action influenced the library's solution of the matter (which is controversial and follows the double standard with which the Library Bill of Rights is applied in libraries concerning media). He furthermore states that the case has not influenced the library's selection of film and other non-print media. However, the catalog of "materials" is extremely conservative, and it is hard to discover any controversial films at all. The director suggested that the only way I could really understand the case would be to come to Peoria and examine the "voluminous files" in detail.

George Holloway in Philadelphia wrote a somewhat cynical letter which suggests that his troubles there were lessened by the death of the trustee (1974) who stirred up the trouble in 1961 (thirteen years...)! He suggests that part of his success is due to the fact that films are loaned only to "adults 18 or older", which is a violation of the Library Bill of Rights, of course. His catalog is quite conservative, although a few risks have been taken. This spring, George sent some clippings about a new censorship struggle having to do with rented "horror" films for a branch programming series. It looked to me as if the library was going to back down on this in the guise of "reconsideration".

Correspondence with the Fairfax County Library was very unsatisfactory. The Coordinator of Special Services answered for the director and referred me to a case study on the Virginia incident in 1963 which I had already read. He did not add any information and made some rather flat statements about "objectives of the Library, the community served, the structure of the Library System", etc....etc. I wrote a more probing follow-up

which was answered, but the issues were not addressed. He did send me a catalog of the current holdings which proved to be extremely conservative.

The correspondence with the Iowa State Travelling Library was largely unsuccessful because the person who was there during the incident (the demand that "Hair" be withdrawn from the recordings collection) had departed sometime earlier and I did not have the time to track him down and follow through with the present staff as well. The present A-V Librarian suggested that their collection was a popular one, and that the absence of anything controversial was therefore understandable. She sent me their catalog and it is indeed devoid of anything remotely concerned with politics, sex, or anything else even slightly controversial.

The most famous case of film censorship occurred at the Los Angeles County Library in 1971. The film librarian has since left the Library and at the time of my study was working on a PhD, the subject of which was the incident at the Los Angeles County Library. He refused to give me further information because of the content of his thesis, and I have been unable to obtain the text of that document (I do not think it is completed). The report in Film Library Quarterly was not helpful to the understanding of of non-print censorship inasmuch as it used a traditional dodge (temporary withdrawal of the materials pending study, and then putting them back into circulation when the case cools down), as I see it. I may be proven wrong when Mr. Sigler's study is finally made public. I had the opportunity to visit Los Angeles County Library and will report on that later.

My follow-up on the graduate and PhD thesises mentioned in Library Literature

had mixed results. The most successful was with Judy Serebnick, Rutgers University. She was quite candid and detailed about her findings, and indicated that the results of her many interviews suggested that librarians have a fear of visualization (sex education, death, violence, etc.). This fear spans books such as the illustrated version of Joy of Sex to scenes from the film Future Shock, which depicts a homosexual marriage. Some public librarians described the importance of public library film collections (e.g., on drugs) because school teachers cannot obtain these films from school film collections. My own observations tell me that this is true as a generalization...schools are even more conservative than public libraries in terms of their inclination to avoid anything even vaguely "controversial".

Unfortunately Charles Busha answered in a kind of pseudo-academic style, avoiding content and in favor of establishing himself as one who does not discriminate against "any particular medium". But his landmark study does not deal with non-print, and evidentally he does not want to talk about that. So if he goes with platitudes he may be another to join with the "printists" in their misunderstanding of the basic problems which are very different for non-print.

I wrote to Marjorie Fiske (now Marjorie Lowenthal) to ask her why she had not considered non-book in her very important study. She just did not respond to the question. I suspect that this might be the case with several others who did not bother to reply at all. Do they feel that they support the inclusion of "materials" in libraries, and the intellectual freedom documents say that their professional association supports this, and

therefore that they need not go any farther?

III. Plan and Make-up of the Questionnaires for the Library Visits

I took as much information as I had in mid-August and put together two questionnaires--one for the institutional considerations* and another for the personal and professional considerations* of the A-V Librarian at the institution to be studies. Then I backed up and put together a visit sequence to give the librarians an idea of what I wanted. I wrote to all of the librarians a lot during this time to set the stage for the visits and follow-up. They were for the most part helpful and cooperative. I guess the main problem was to assure them that I was not after them or their institutions as examples of the problem, but wanted a geographical spread, a sounding board for the problems I was concerned with, etc.

The visit was planned roughly in this way. I set a tentative appointment with the A-V Librarian for as soon after I got into town and got my lodging squared away as possible. Then I went to the facility and met the librarian and met his or her staff. I went over the plan for the "visit sequence", the first visit to be an explanation of my reading, concerns and some generalizations, and a brief run-down of the institutional and personal questionnaires. I asked the librarian to see if arrangements could be made so that I could visit with the administrators to whom the librarian reports in the hierarchy.

The next visit usually dealt with the institutional questionnaire, and

*Appendix #1

included a thorough briefing and visit with the main library and its media facility. The follow-up went into the personal views of staff, not necessarily toward the service involved in the visit, but often very closely related to it. Meanwhile, I visited branch libraries and generally acquainted myself with the system, so that I could talk with the A-V Librarian's supervisor. All the time I was photographing the libraries, talking to other staff members, and doing tape recordings and taking notes. Eventually I got to see a top administrator in all the systems I visited (only at Chicago Public Library was I unable to meet with the Director of the library). Usually I departed a day or so later, and have corresponded with the librarians since to clear up a few points which were not clarified during the visit (e.g., the percentages devoted to non-book out of the materials budget in each system).

VISITS

The ideal thing would be to summarize the points raised within each system in comparison with the other systems, including the visit to the office of the ALA. Unfortunately, I will not have time for that here. So I will simply give the highlights of the visits to the five places.

A. Boston

Boston Public Library was an ideal system to visit for a comparison of the problems of old and new in architecture and attitudes. The old building has had an addition built on it which houses the A-V section. The old building has the audio-visual archive in the basement. This archive was

unique in all the systems visited, and points up a heretofore unthought of problem for libraries...the intellectual freedom aspect of the retrospective collection of non-print.

The new building is a disappointment as far as media facilities and playback go. Typically, the department is in the basement, the building is not properly wired, the meeting room doesn't even have a projection screen, etc. Individual access for viewing materials is haphazard and not really available. The children's and young adult areas have no provision for media facilities whatsoever.

The materials selection situation is not backed up by a written selection policy. A young staff person is in charge of the previewing operation and does have some controversial and locally produced materials coming through. From what I gather, the more "radical" materials which have been favorably previewed have been passed over for duplicates of more popular titles.

There are a few films which can be considered controversial. Other than the collection of feature films, I found the collection to be somewhat conservative in nature. The department services, the needs of a large region, and this service area were given as some of the reasons for the dominance of popular titles and heavy duplication.

Staff members were very different in attitudes, from the helpful, harassed man in charge, Ed Peltier, to the somewhat angry a-v technician and the impatient, "let's-get-on-with-it" woman in charge of previewing and media advisory. The only professional I met during my study who is a member of

the ACLU and takes a more active interest in civil liberties was Ed Peltier's assistant librarian.

Just before I left, Ed mentioned a problem film which he has had in a "withdrawn" status for over a year (without the Director's knowledge). The Exiles by Kent McKenzie received a complaint from one woman claiming to represent an Indian organization (on typed letterhead), and thus the film was kept out of the new catalog. The film is recognized as a modern classic of sorts, having won prizes at many festivals and having achieved some fame as a controversial film on the plight of the Inner-City Indians. I asked that the film be sent to the headquarters of the American Indian Movement. They gave it very good marks. I do not know what has happened to the film in the meantime. This is the kind of treatment that a controversial item can receive when there are not adequate guidelines adopted by the individual library (as recommended by ALA) to handle such problems.

B. Chicago

Chicago's film department and audio collection are located in the old (presently being remodeled) central library building. There are still DC power plugs visible in the A-V department. The building is being "gutted" and remodeled to make way for its new status as a cultural center. The A-V department will remain in the building, whereas the subject departments have been removed to temporary quarters in another building. This paradoxical survival in the old building is a mixed blessing for the staff.

Peoria Library was the first library to make me really aware of the problems of "labelling" in film catalogs (watch out for this one sort of thing), plus the possible labelling of film cans. This double labelling problem is

something which has not, to my knowledge, been mentioned in the literature. Another problem I discovered was the definite lack of bibliographic access (more or less the same in Boston as well). This is undoubtedly a censorship problem inasmuch as patrons get very unequal treatment in the access to print, and should expect to get the same for non-book.

Generally, A-V and film librarians point to the inadequate film catalog descriptions and indexes to those, and rough shelving categories (long playing records) as "access" to the materials.

A surprise at Chicago was the discovery of a film from which footage has been deleated by a former librarian (because it had scenes from a doll factory--nude dolls!). The film is still in circulation, with a notation on the film control card. This made my imagination run rampant, wondering just how much this has been done throughout the country.

The facilities are totally inadequate. Of course, they may be improved somewhat during the remodeling process (I hope to visit there this fall). Everything from projection facilities (inferior sound system) to the ancient turntables and headphones in the audio area guaranteed technical distortion and censorship of the media.

Diane Purtill, the woman in charge, considers herself an administrator first and is only in A-V as an "administrative step". Her staff is far more concerned and pointed up the afore-mentioned problems to me. I think this can be a problem in a situation in a system where a move to an A-V department can mean a promotion and the administration does not consider

subject expertise requisite for the administrative role. I am not saying that Diane is not a fine professional or that she is not trying to make the A-V operation work, but she is just less concerned than her staff with the gut issues of A-V.

Chicago has a few film titles which are slightly controversial, but its collection follows the same cautious, mainline approach as film collections usually do. Again, there are not adequate policies and guidelines to back up the librarians in their pursuit of integrated, risk-taking collection building.

C. ALA Headquarters

I spent a couple of hours one afternoon with Judy Krug and Roger Funk. They had not run the CLR press release (as requested) in the Intellectual Freedom Newsletter and had not responded to correspondence adequately, so I felt a certain uneasiness during the visit.

I stated my concerns and they either rationalized for the profession (e.g., on the economic reasons why non-print could not be purchased) or just plain did not respond. I honestly think that they have not considered the blatant problems involved. For example, the"Green Sheets", a film labelling operation entered into by the ALA years ago with the motion picture industry, has not been considered a labelling problem. So it was frustrating to bring up several issues and just plain not get responses to them.

There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that the ALA Headquarters operation mirrors the "printism" problem in its rawest form, from the

Headquarters Library (total dominance of print, condition and age of the equipment, shelving of materials--film cans sitting on the floor, inadequate subject cataloguing, a lack of print materials on non-print, etc.), the awards offered in the name of the organization (not one non-print award as of 1976), the lack of standards for media playback quality (for meetings and for group and individual access in libraries), public relations (everything from summer reading programs to suggested gambits such as "What Americans Are Reading" columns), to print dominated reading and materials lists (e.g., the"Bicentennial Reading, Viewing, Listening"list by the American Issues Forum), etc. The Director and other officers in the organization underline this in almost all of their public appearances, using print almost in every instance as the example of library activity and the purpose of the profession.

I talked with Mr. Wedgeworth about these and other problems. He was cordial but seemingly unconcerned with the issues. There was the constant threat of interruption and the feeling that I was given an appointment just as an aside to more pressing, got-to-be-done concerns. A week before I spoke with him he had addressed the press in Minneapolis and given print in all his examples of library materials. I mentioned this and he simply did not respond to it. "Printism" is just so inherent by now, from top to bottom.

The feeling that the ALA Headquarters staff members are kind of the arch victims of the profession (especially stated by the Office of Intellectual Freedom staff) left me somewhat confused. In other words, this or that office takes the brunt of a complaint, or is blamed for an attitude which is inherent in the mind sets of the profession, etc.

I spent several hours in the Library there, going over the very early issues of the Intellectual Freedom Newsletter (would you believe that issue number one, page one featured a story about the film incident in Peoria?!). The Library does not collect non-print media unless it is produced by or for the ALA! The younger staff members are very critical of the way media (especially equipment) has been handled in the Library. Especially valuable were some of the old files which contained information on things such as the "Green Sheets". I was surprised to find the catalog "integrated" at all, although the cataloguing is minimal.

D. Kansas City Public Library

Kansas City Public Library is located in a very large building shared with the Kansas City schools. The building is very heavily "wired", ready on each and every floor with plenty of electrical power to make the "new" technology and media work. The Library has not done very well. It has, in the last few years (under new leadership), increased its activity in computer use, and to a much smaller extent, the Film Department has also increased.

Perhaps the picture (a symbol so strong in my mind) is of the somewhat ancient, mono, broken table-top record players with "out of order" and "not to be used by anyone under 12" signs on them. The headphones look like something current in Thomas Edison's time. The anomaly of this is never so strong as when you think of your own standards for home use, or the importance of audio standards demanded by the general public.

The projection facilities are quite good. Penny Northern is a film librarian with a well-deserved reputation and features film in the building programs.

This was the best projection booth I saw on my trip. The film collection is a nice, conservative one, strong on the contemporary classic films which are so glaringly absent in other collections. But typically, the collection takes few if any risks. Since I was there, Mrs. Northern has had a problem with a relatively conservative film entitled About Sex.

As in the other libraries visited, there is severely limited bibliographic access to the films and no individual access to speak of, although a rear screen unit has been purchased to facilitate the previewing (primarily by groups) of film.

I visited branch libraries in all the libraries I visited. The ones in Kansas City were typical in their lack of audio-visual designing and somewhat primitive and (in some cases) retrospective design solutions for media. The only "vital" branch activity observed was that in the libraries in the poorer Black areas, where the environments were more vibrant and the media a bit more in play.

One thing I should say is that I was greeted graciously everywhere I went, and was particularly struck (especially in Kansas City with Penny) by the guts and forebearing it must take to put services together under such (to me) demeaning circumstances. It is a tribute to all the professionals visited that film and media services manage to exist at all.

E. Los Angeles County Library

I chose Los Angeles County Library because of the BIG censorship case there several years ago. Much has happened since, including the change of Library

leadership and the A-V/Film Librarian. Presumably the case is somewhat buried by now, but I felt the presence of it in so many ways, especially in the obvious absence of controversial films which have been offered on the market since that time.

The Library (like so many others) still does not have an up-to-date statement to back up materials selection and other intellectual freedom concerns. Getting into conversation with Joyce Sumbi, I found out that prior censorship had occurred (with a film shot in Los Angeles on homosexuality) and will likely occur again.

I felt the negative power of size at Los Angeles County Library. This feeling was that censorship can take place in "holding" baskets and filing cabinets, and the hapless patrons and librarians might find any dialog about censorship problems (whatever their guises) snuffed in paper, procedures, etc.

I am not sure how true it is, or whether it is just my interpretation. Undoubtedly, it has something to do with size and "distance" (that someone up there may receive the message someday, but meanwhile we can not buy that film, or put that program together, etc.). It will be interesting to see if Ron Sigler's (former film librarian) thesis takes this aspect on at all.

Both Boston and Los Angeles County had done some fairly good audio-visual designing in their audio listening centers--Los Angeles in their newer branches, Boston in their central A-V center. Otherwise, the picture was very bleak for A-V design. The only television design I saw was in Los

Angeles. The County has put in TV surveillance systems in its newer agencies. Unfortunately, this was not designed in a flexible way so the monitors cannot be used for non-surveillance purposes.

There is no central library as such for Los Angeles County Library; the offices of the administration and support staff are located in a very large county building. The impossibly crowded conditions in the A-V area make previewing of the materials an ingenious exercise, and ensures that the audio and visual fidelity of the material will be censored in the process.

F. Visits to Other Libraries--Atlanta Public Library, Columbus (Ohio) Public Library, San Francisco Public Library, Los Angeles Public Library, and others

I found the situation in these other libraries to be much the same as in the libraries focused upon in the study. For example, there were either no selection policy statements, or none which dealt with the specifics needed beyond what the ALA suggests (e.g., technological considerations, individual access to media, etc.). It may be that the inability of libraries to make up "current" materials selection policy and intellectual freedom statements has much to do with the inability to deal with the concepts embodied in actual and potential non-print problems (e.g., reconciling contradictory age limitations for media check-out).

Facilities were very poor for the most part. All of them guaranteed distortion of the media in playback, lack of access, equipment, etc. Questions about the future were usually met in a frustrated or bewildered fashion. With the exception of the visit to the Atlanta Public Library, I saw very little hope for media facilities in any of the institutions visited.

The lack of access through age restrictions, media not having been catalogued properly, and little or no individual access to playback was the same (with the exception of one library). Individual access to audio is a pattern, although it is generally substandard in reproduction quality. Film catalog descriptions sometimes labelled the materials in violation of ALA guidelines. Budgets are substandard, even in relation to the abysmal percentages recommended for non-print by ALA guidelines.

Media collections reflect a condescending attitude (e.g., toward programming, children's work, etc.) which denies them the importance of a corollary position in regard to the subject collections of the libraries. Thus there is no retrospective effort to speak of, in, for example, historic recordings (oral history), community video tapes, etc. The one exception seems to be an awareness of locally produced 16mm films. Experimental film is being purchased by some of the larger collections.

The further implication is that radical or controversial materials are all but absent. I used a checklist of radical media producers to verify this. I found only a few titles in all the libraries visited. The fact is that non-print collections do not even begin to match the subject matter we take for granted in print. The excuse for this is that it would be redundant to add non-print materials for which there is coverage in print! This rationalization flies in the face of the way people learn today.

So there is a continued and almost total domination of print in all the libraries visited. The graphic displays and other public relations programs, lack of adequate job descriptions for A-V personnel, the unexamined rhetoric

of administrators and other librarians, the reading and other learning materials currently pursued by rank and file librarians--all point to a domination so complete that it is difficult for me to understand how media will ever be integrated in libraries.

The censorship of"anal retention" (unnecessary withholding of materials because of fear of loss or mutilation) seems to have shifted from print to non-print materials.

The paradox is that there seems to have been a somewhat dramatic increase in non-print budgets from zero to three percent two or three years ago to five to fifteen percent today. The problem with this is that it is often dependent upon caprice or a vague response to "guidelines" and does not seem to have any basis in policy, short or long range planning, or development from within the subject departments or decision-makers of the libraries.

PERSONNEL

I found that with one exception the librarians I talked with were not personally involved in an overt awareness of civil liberties, censorship/ intellectual freedom. The one person is a member of ACLU and seemingly does not relate her awareness with that activity to library (non-print) matters. I have been a member of the ACLU for many, many years, and have been very aware of censorship problems in libraries, but I always restricted this awareness to print--that is, until I had to teach the subject to critical students!

Part of the problem is specialization. One has just so much time, and that goes to film previewing (many A-V librarians have to preview at home or on their own time nowadays), keeping up with the journals, etc. It is just a matter of personal survival to limit other inputs. There is a fair amount of evidence that the libraries for which these librarians work go along with this. Who could imagine a library pushing its A-V people to be more critical of their collections and work in terms of prior censorship, standards, programming, etc.?

The people I talked with agreed that there was simply no talk in A-V meetings about censorship. It is considered a moot issue. Many of the people I have talked to simply assume that censorship occurs only in print. The strange thing is that when I questioned them further I found that there are little "brush fire" non-print struggles going on all over the place. The fact of the matter is that there were non-book censorship cases present (or soon to happen) in all the four primary systems I visited.

Most people agreed that there is self-censorship involved and that prior censorship is a major problem. The common rationalization (sometimes used for print) is that funds must be spent for more popular materials and duplicates and therefore films which might be considered controversial become somewhat "exotic" in their environments. Things are said in this regard which would never be acceptable explanations for print selection. When asked what materials they considered to be "controversial" in their collections, the rationalizations were usually repeated and a few quasi-interesting titles mentioned. I found only a few political films in all the collections I visited which could really be considered "radical" in content, and these were not in the major collections I visited.

A few "closet" cases of non-print censorship were mentioned. Otherwise, the librarians referred to the case at Los Angeles County as the case they knew about. When asked about the absence of cases in terms of the power of the media, most people just kind of shrugged their shoulders. The most interesting thing was that no one seemed to recall censorship of media until they thought a little more about it. Then a few fascinating and obscurred cases surfaced, including one in Boston which to my knowledge has not yet been resolved.

I found that the A-V librarians I talked with had simply not applied the Library Bill of Rights to non-print. They had not thought out the implications of the fact that there is literally no individual access to visual media, that there are special age restrictions, fees, little bibliographic information, and that labelling is quite common (e.g., film catalog descriptions). Most severe are the miserable standards for the playback of visual and audio media (and the almost total absence of television in the libraries) and the drastic censorship of pictorial and audio "content" in the process. The acceptance of these conditions as a "given" factor in their work was a definite precondition for the acceptance of censorship.

People were a little more outspoken about the lack of staff to do adequate previewing and selection. Most of them professed to being so overwhelmed with basic survival problems that the concerns expressed in my institutional and personal questions were simply not actively present for them. For example, how could they think about whether to program radical filmmakers in their institutions when they could hardly think about programming at all? How to interact with local video people when they were unable to cope with 16mm film?

CONCLUSIONS

"Primacy of print" is still very much in command. Any concern for non-print censorship from the middle 1950's onward has been secondary. Standards still focus on print (e.g., number of volumes per library, reading light levels, etc.) to the virtual exclusion of an awareness of non-book issues (projection standards, individual access, the presence of controversial software, etc.).

"Printism" pervades library school education (e.g., Intellectual Freedom courses), the policies and styles at ALA Headquarters (printist terminology in the OIF's documents, the examples of "materials" used in official ALA lists, press releases, PR, ect.). Standards/guidelines are printist in orientation, and are often disregarded if they do suggest a higher percentage of non-book in the collections.

A double standard pervades the enforcement of the vague supports given to media in the intellectual freedom documents of ALA. For example, there are special age restrictions imposed, fees, a lack of individual and bibliographic access. Add to this a reluctance to spend the minimum amounts suggested for films, recordings, etc. Often this double standard is reinforced by the position of stepchild within the library system, with the purpose of jazzing up the library programs, providing for public visability, etc. Seldom do subject specialists work closely with the film librarians to help with selection. "Intellectual" is so "printist" in concept that most librarians have not a clue about the dire consequances of sensory censorship in an age where electronic/electric media prevails in society.

The double standards and contradictions span from the Headquarters of ALA to the very smallest public libraries and school media centers. Examine, for example, the way that films are stored in the Headquarters Library, or the age and condition of their equipment there. Or look at the range of intellectual and controversial concepts which are covered in the film and video collections of the libraries of our nation, from the universities to the smallest public libraries. What about the fidelity of playback? One of the major public libraries in this country does not even have a projection screen in its meeting room.

There is good reason to believe that libraries may try to avoid a confrontation with this 'bete noire' of censorship by continuing to side-step it, make it the "straw man" in the arguments for cutting services in the general budgetary loss picture; or they may try to use microfiche and other new forms of print as evidence of budget spent for non-print. Examination of the award winners in library architecture points up that most structures are not being designed for today's information formats, and that censorship of non-book is all but guaranteed in these "designs".

This technological censorship is actually and potentially a very severe and unrecognized problem. While librarians refuse to consider design problems and solutions to make individual and group access to non-book media both inside and outside the library, they are moving very rapidly on the technological availability of print (microfiche/microfilm, computers) and the use of technology to process (primary), circulate, and protect print.

When a few of the very polite A-V librarians do hint at an attack on these and other problems, they are usually cautioned about "constraints" and similar

arguments which would never be palatable for talk about print. The "advocacy" role of media librarians has been exercised in things like "Cinema Nightcaps", library public relations, and in quiet, low-key institutes.

At present the access to media in libraries is very poor, especially on an individual basis. In many systems the only access is to audio, and most often that is on inferior equipment (which would not be tolerated in a household). Individual access is virtually unknown, with a handful of exceptions. Collections are,for the most part (there are exceptions), a "Disneyland of the mind". Their "popular", uncontroversial nature guarantees a low visability in the Newsletter of Intellectual Freedom.

This is what I suggest:

1) Advocates of intellectual freedom must finally face an awareness of "printism", the assumptions of which pervade our literature, job descriptions, library school education, policies and standards (guidelines), budgets,and basic attitudes; not to mention our intellectual freedom documents.
2) The Office of Intellectual Freedom and the Intellectual Freedom Committee should re-examine their documents and attitudes and take the initiative in defeating the double standard which keeps non-print substandard and bypassed in the struggle for equal treatment of our "other library materials".
3) That bibliographic access for all library materials be provided to give them the basic dignity of a full integration into the collections.

4) Libraries must finally face the technological era in which we live and the communication standards with which we exist. Our standards (guidelines) should reflect technological considerations which will insure fidelity of playback and other presentation (including the future considerations of design such as video transmission, recording and translation capabilities, etc.) problems. Technological censorship must be recognized as one of our most dire problems.

5) There should be an effort made to urge sensory richness in all library collections, especially subject collections. A parallel effort must be made to insure a place in our collections for controversial media of all kinds.

6) The inherent censorship in short and long range planning should be recognized now. For example, if we continue to design buildings without the considerations for non-print media (especially in playback, storage, and transmission potential) we will surely have to be involved in even greater censorship problems in the near and distant future.

7) There should be more in-depth study of this problem, including statistical analysis and future projections. My feeling is that the printist nature of our profession will simply not face this problem (paradoxically) unless it is convinced first "IN PRINT".

POSSIBLE RAMIFICATIONS OF MY STUDY

I would like to confront the Office of Intellectual Freedom and the Intellectual Freedom Committee on the subject of non-print censorship. I will send a press release with a summary of my results to the Newsletter on Intellectual Freedom. Within the coming months I plan to prepare a brief summary for the OIF/IFC and ask to present it to them. My hope is that a major program sponsored jointly by the PLA A-V Committee, the ISAD A-V Committee, AECT and the IFC could be presented to confront the present and future problems of this aspect of censorship.

I am going to disseminate my information in a series of articles to cover the broadest spectrum of interest and opinion in library and media circles (e.g., I have just sent the first to Catholic Library World). In coming months there will be articles sent to Televisions (magazine), Sightlines, and the HCL Cataloguing Newsletter. My hope is to have these articles written and disseminated within two years.

I plan to keep "second publication rights" intact so that the articles can be compiled into a book format at a later date. I will write to Karl Nyren at Library Journal in the coming weeks about the possibility of incorporating these in one of a series of paperbacks planned for a new special report series which is planned by Library Journal.

I will continue to do presentations for library schools, institutes,

conferences, and conventions on the subject. This will include the slides I shot and the audio-tape recordings made during the study.*

*To date:

1) The Educational Resources Roundtable (Minnesota)

2) State University of New York at Buffalo (a national institute on censorship for library school teachers)

3) ALTA Intellectual Freedom Committee Panel member at the Chicago ALA Conference (7/17/76) entitled "What Trustees Can Do To Preserve Intellectual Freedom" (this program was dedicated primarily to a focus on non-print censorship)

4) An HCL Staff Meeting summary (I am to do a half-hour presentation to go into this further in October)

APPENDIX #1

INSTITUTIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

1) Materials Selection Policy (Examine for a reflection of A-V awareness--e.g., how the individual libraries have gone beyond the ALA in pushing "intellectual freedom" for A-V)

Previewing--check preview slips (Alternative producers--left/right, sensual, women, local producers)

Selection--what is the collection like? (Classics, standard lists, etc.)

Collection building--part of subject collections

Percentage of budget--retrospective

2) Cataloging/classification and processing

Access--equality with print (Packaged for wear, security, etc., visit the cataloger's?)

3) Patron Access (Is security used as a rationalization to restrict use...unnecessarily?)

Eligilibity for use

Special fees

Inter-Library loan, etc.

Restrictions on use

Individual use availability (on premises)

Quality of reproduction

Qualifications for meeting room, etc.

Quality of projection and audio (e.g., arc projectors, sound systems, etc.)

Feedback mechanisms to the library staff/ administration

4) Equipment--range and depth for the program
- Quality
- Production equipment
- Branches
- Equipment--"down-time"

5) Architectural Planning

Standards in the building program

Input of A-V personnel

Individual access within the building program

Training for A-V personnel for architectural and design considerations

6) Personnel

Meet ALA standards

Job descriptions

Technical support

7) Relationship to Mass Media

Depository of video/audio

Relationship to NRP and NET, university media collections and the networks

PERSONAL CONSIDERATIONS

1) How involved have you been in censorship/intellectual freedom? (conferences, ACLU membership--SRRT, etc.) Have you studied the problem in terms of A-V? (new EFLA interest, "Freedom to View" column) Are you aware of the ALA "Green Sheets"?

2) Professional commitments (attendance at state conferences, workshops, reading of Intellectual Freedom Newsletter, etc.)

3) Lack of concern in A-V meetings. PLA, AECT, etc. Library education, equipment, rental/lease plan, etc.

4) Feeling about self-consorship, as far as A-V is concerned (e.g., Fiske study, Busha, etc.) What materials do you consider to be "controversial" in your collection--compared to print?

5) Cases you know of non-print censorship--including your institution. What instances have you faced?

6) Individual access and the Library Bill of Rights: Will A-V ever have respect if it doesn't get beyond the group access category? (basic violation of the Library Bill of Rights)

SUBJECTIVE CONSIDERATIONS--BEYOND THE INDIVIDUAL LIBRARY

Previewing--staff time (beyond the A-V departments)
Commitment of administrators/general staff to A-V (e.g., subject collections) vs. "primacy of print"

Access:
- Bibliographic
- Projection and sound systems
- Mass media

Professional Commitments

Programming:
- Radical filmmakers
- Video people
- Rental films
- Carrot and Stick media?

APPENDIX #2

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Library Association. Conference on Intellectual Freedom. Freedom of Inquiry, Supporting the Library Bill of Rights, proceedings. A.L.A., Washington, D.C., c1965.

American Library Association. Office for Intellectual Freedom Manual. A.L.A., Chicago. c1974.

Anderson, Arthur James. Problems in Intellectual Freedom and Censorship. R.R. Bowker Co., New York. c1974.

Berninghausen, David K. The Flight From Reason: Essays on Intellectual Freedom in the Academy, the Press, and the Library. A.L.A., Chicago. c1975.

Busha, Charles H. Freedom Versus Suppression and Censorship: with a study of the attitudes of Midwestern public librarians and a bibliography of censorship. Libraries Unlimited. Littleton, Colorado. c1772.

DeGrazia, Edward. Censorship Landmarks. R.R. Bowker Co., N.Y. c1969.

Downs, Robert Bingham. First Freedom: Liberty and Justice in the World of Books and Reading. A.L.A., Chicago. c1960.

Ernest, Morris Leopold and Schwartz. A-V Censorship: The Search for the Obscure. MacMillan, New York. c1964.

Grove, Pearce S. and Clement, Evelyn G. (ed.). Bibliographic Control of Non-Print Media. A.L.A., Chicago. c1972.

Hamlin, Peter R. Case Study of the Fairfax County, Virginia Censorship Controversy. University of Illinois, School of Library Science. Occasional papers, no. 95. c 1963. University of Illinois, Graduate School of Library Science. Urbana. c1968.

Hart, Harold H. Censorship: For and Against. Hart Publishing Co. N.Y. c1971.

Hill, Robert. Intellectual Freedom: A Bibliography by Robert Hill, Sharon Perry and Elizabeth Wolcott. California State College, Fullerton, Calif. n.d.

Hoyt, Olga. Censorship in America. Seabury Press. N.Y., c1970.

Liston, Robert A. The Right to Know: Censorship in America. Watts. N.Y. c1973.

McClellan, Grant Samuel (ed). Censorship in the United States. Wilson, N.Y. c1967.

McKeon, Richard; Merton, Robert K. and Gellhorn, Walter. The Freedom to Read: Perspective and Program. R.R. Bowker Co. N.Y. c1957.

Moon, Eric. Book Selection and Censorship in the Sixties. R.R. Bowker Co., N.Y. c1969.

Moon Eric and Nygren, Karl (ed). Library Issues: The Sixties. R.R. Bowker, Co. N.Y. c1970.

Oboler, Eli M. The Fear of the Word: Censorship and Sex. Scarecrow Press. Metuchen, N.J. c1974.

Pope, Michael. Sex and the Undecided Librarian: A Study of Librarians on Sexual Literature. Scarecrow Press. Metuchen, N.J. c1974.

Randall, Richard S. Censorship of the Movies: The Social and Political Control of a Mass Medium. University of Wisconsin Press. Madison, c1968.

Shores, Louis. Audiovisual Librarianship: The Crusade for Media Unity (1946-1969). Libraries Unlimited, Inc. Littleton, Colo. c1973.

APPENDIX #3

PERCENTAGE OF MATERIALS BUDGETS DEVOTED TO

AUDIO-VISUAL MATERIALS

Boston Public Library

Year	Total Expenditure for Materials	Expenditure for A-V Materials	Percentage Spent on A-V
1968	$ 683,006.94	$ 31,176.72	4.5%
1969	$ 785,388.60	$ 12,016.95	1.5%
1970	$ 848,525.74	$ 11,883.98	1.4%
1971	$ 897,713.71	$ 22,906.93	2.5%
1972	$ 910,480.26	$ 40,996.27	4.5%
1973	$ 1,000,673.28	$ 27,648.81	2.7%
1974	$ 1,036,524.75	$ 33,953.22	3.3%

Chicago Public Library

1972	$ 2,840,869.00	$ 260,828.00	9.18%
1973	$ 1,820,503.00	$ 355,252.00	19.51%
1974	$ 2,719,085.00	$ 49,073.00	1.8%
1975	$ 1,992,910.00	$ 383,573.00	19.25%

Kansas City Public Library

Year	Total Expenditure for Materials	Expenditure for 16mm Films	Percentage Spent on 16mm
1960	$ 195,868.00	$ 8,510.00	4.3%
1961	$ 179,995.00	$ 8,670.00	4.8%
1962	$ 181,780.00	$ 9,210.00	5.1%
1963	$ 225,445.00	$ 8,940.00	4.0%
1964	$ 247,586.00	$ 12,564.00	5.1%
1965	$ 201,368.00	$ 8,965.00	4.5%
1966	$ 230,249.00	$ 9,241.00	4.0%
1967	$ 334,419.00	$ 16,149.00	4.8%
1968	$ 267,150.00	$ 17,232.00	6.5%
1969	$ 328,468.00	$ 23,186.00	7.1%
1970	$ 368,736.00	$ 18,500.00	5.0%
1971	$ 287,759.00	$ 12,276.00	4.3%
1972	$ 299,971.00	$ 11,850.00	4.0%
1973	$ 209,548.00	$ 21,000.00	10.0%
1974	$ 289,984.00	$ 14,636.00	5.0%
1975	$ 320,000.00	$ 30,000.00	9.4%

Los Angeles County Library

Year	Total Expenditure for Audio-Visual
1973-1974	$ 121,900.00
1974-1975	$ 1[illegible]0,000.00
1975-1976	$ 160,000.00
1976-1977	$ 176,000.00

Note: There were not accurate records available for use at Los Angeles County Library. The percentage for non-print ranges between 7.5%-8% (which includes supplies such as bulbs, record jackets, styli, forms, etc.). The only dollar figures available are those shown above.